



United States
of America

Approved For Release 2001/08/30 : CIA-RDP77M00144R000800100026-8

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 121

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1975

No. 33

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter; fear God and keep His Commandments; for this is the whole duty of Man.—Ecclesiastes 12: 13.

O Thou who hast given us the day for work and the night for rest, grant that we may so work and so rest that we may have health of body, harmony of mind, and happiness of spirit. Enable us this day and every day to do our work with insight and integrity, to relate ourselves to one another with faith and forgiveness and to humbly walk with Thee as we keep in mind the highest good of our Nation.

Bless our Members of Congress and help them to lead our Republic in the paths of peace, freedom, and good will. Bless our citizens that following wise leadership they may not shrink from the disciplines which accompany life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all.

May we now and always keep ourselves dedicated to Thee and to the best interests of our beloved land.

In the spirit of Him who came to bring life to all we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 28, 1975, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution making further urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE WITHIN TAX REDUCTION MEASURE

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the effort to deal with the oil depletion allowance within the framework of this important tax reduction measure.

It is absolutely vital that the House and Senate speedily send to the President this measure which will greatly stimulate the purchasing power of American citizens and the ability of American business to expand and improve production. All of us are banking on the assumption that these tax rebates and reductions will take the steam out of the economic nosedive the country is in. This bill is one of the essential building blocks in a program to restore and revitalize the American economy.

The matter of the oil depletion allowance is also of great importance. It will be dealt with in either an energy or a tax reform package early this year.

It is absolutely essential that the House send this tax reduction bill to the Senate unfettered by other matters. I hope that a majority of my colleagues can appreciate the prudential nature of this approach.

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BRADEMAS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RESOLUTIONS OF INQUIRY REQUESTING EXECUTIVE BRANCH TO FURNISH CERTAIN INFORMATION ON U.S. POLICY TOWARD CHILE

(Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1975, the Committee on Foreign Affairs met in open session to consider

House Resolution 206 and House Resolution 207 which were introduced by the Honorable MICHAEL HARRINGTON.

The committee voted 19 to 9 in favor of a motion to lay the resolutions on the table.

House Resolution 206 directs the Secretary of State to furnish to the Committee on Foreign Affairs certain information on U.S. policy toward Chile from 1964 through 1973:

H. RES. 206

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to furnish to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, within ten days, the following information:

1964 ELECTIONS

1. Did the Forty Committee authorize funds for payment to opponents of Salvador Allende, prior to the Chilean national elections of 1964? If so, what were the specific dates of the authorization(s), to what individuals or organizations were payments made, and what was the amount of each of these payments? In what currency or currencies were the payments made? Describe the method through which each such payment was made.

1970 ELECTIONS

2. Did the Forty Committee authorize the expenditure of approximately \$1,000,000 in 1969 and 1970 to attempt to prevent the election of Salvador Allende as President of Chile? If so, what were the specific dates of the authorization(s)? What was the exact amount of the funds distributed? To what individuals and organizations were payments made, and in what amounts? In what currency or currencies were payments made? Describe the method through which each such payment was made.

SCHEME TO BRIBE CHILEAN CONGRESS

3. Did the Forty Committee, on September 18, 1970, authorize a plan to spend \$350,000 for the purpose of bribing members of the Chilean Congress so as to prevent the ratification of the election of Salvador Allende as President of Chile? If so, were the funds expended? What was the disposition of this plan?

1970: ANTI-ALLENDE MEDIA CAMPAIGN

4. Did the Forty Committee authorize the expenditure of approximately \$500,000 in the summer of 1970 to finance anti-Allende media? If so, what were the specific dates of the authorization(s)? What was the exact amount of the funds distributed? To what individuals or organizations were payments made, and in what amounts? In what currency or currencies were the payments made?

H 1277

March 3, 1975

Describe the method through which each such payment was made.

Post-1970: \$5,000,000

5. Did the Forty Committee, subsequent to the Chilean national elections in September 1970, authorize the expenditure of approximately \$5,000,000 for the purpose of assisting groups and individuals, including political parties, organizations, and news media, opposed to the government of President Allende? If so, what was the exact amount of funds expended? To what individuals or organizations were payments made, and in what amounts? In what currency or currencies were the payments made? Describe the method through which these payments were made.

1973: MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

6. Did the Forty Committee authorize the expenditure of approximately \$1,500,000 for payments to and support of candidates in the 1973 municipal elections who were opposed to the government of President Allende? If so, what was the exact amount of the payments made? To whom were payments made, and in what amounts? In what currencies were the payments made? Describe the method through which each payment was made.

1973: \$1,000,000

7. Did the Forty Committee, in or about August 1973, authorize the expenditure of \$1,000,000 for the purpose of assisting groups, individuals, political parties, organizations, and news media opposed to the government of President Allende? If so, what was the exact amount of funds expended? To what individuals or organizations were payments made, and in what amounts? In what currency or currencies were the payments made? Describe the method through which each payment was made.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

8. What Members of the United States Congress, if any, were informed of each operation authorized by the Forty Committee to provide funds or assistance to opponents of Salvador Allende, before such operations were carried out? On what dates were Members of Congress so informed? How were Members of Congress so informed?

STATE DEPARTMENT PARTICIPATION

9. What were the names and positions of members of the Department of State who were informed before September 11, 1973, of covert operations of American agencies, as authorized by the Forty Committee, to provide funds or other assistance to opponents of the government of President Allende, from 1963 to September 11, 1973?

(a) Which members of the staff of the American Embassy in Chile were informed of these operations during their tenure in Chile, and were these staff members informed of the operations before or after they were carried out?

(b) Was Assistant Secretary of State Charles Meyers informed of any such operations, prior to March 27, 1973?

(c) Was former Ambassador to Chile Edward Korry informed of any such operations, prior to March 27, 1973?

(d) Was Deputy Chief of Mission Harry Shlaudeman informed of any such operations, prior to June 12, 1974?

(e) Was Nathaniel Davis, Ambassador to Chile from 1971 to 1973, informed of any such operations, prior to November 9, 1973?

ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

10. Did the Government of the United States adopt a policy of economic sanctions against the Government of Chile after the election of Salvador Allende as President of Chile in 1970? Did the United States Government seek to deny loans and other forms of economic assistance to Chile from the Export-Import Bank, the Inter-American

Development Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, or the International Monetary Fund? If so, when was such a policy of economic sanctions implemented? If estimates were made by State Department officials as to how much such sanctions would cost the Government and economy of Chile, please supply these estimates. Did any United States representative to the aforementioned financial institutions receive any instructions, memorandums or other documents or communications concerning economic assistance to Chile, and if so, list and provide copies of such documents or communications.

INTERAGENCY ECONOMIC POLICY GROUP

11. Was there an interagency group, in which a representative of the Department of State participated, established in or after November 1970, to consider, evaluate, and formulate American economic policy toward Chile? If so, what was the membership of this group? List and provide copies of any documents or memorandums prepared or issued by this group in which economic policy toward Chile is discussed.

CHILE'S CREDIT

12. Did the Government of the United States seek and receive the cooperation of American banks and other financial institutions in reducing the line of credit available to Chile from American banks and other financial institutions, and in preventing the renegotiation of the Chilean foreign debt? If so, with which banks or financial institutions did representatives of the Government of the United States discuss private as well as public economic policy toward Chile? Which banks or financial institutions actually cooperated and participated in the policy? What officials in the executive branch participated in such discussions? When were such actions authorized, and by what agency?

STATE DEPARTMENT OBJECTIONS

13. Did officials of the Department of State, between 1963 and September 11, 1973, object in writing to plans of the Forty Committee and/or the Central Intelligence Agency to provide funds or other assistance to anti-Allende organizations or individuals? Provide copies of all such objections, including those memorandums or documents dated August 30, 1970, September 4, 1970, and July 25, 1973. To which specific plans did the State Department object, and what were the reasons cited in the objections?

STATEMENT OF HENRY KISSINGER

14. On what facts did you base your statement of September 17, 1973:

"The Central Intelligence Agency had nothing to do with the coup, to the best of my knowledge and belief, and I only put in that qualification in case a madman appears down there who, without instructions, talked to somebody. I have absolutely no reason to suppose it."

House Resolution 207 directs the President of the United States to provide the committee similar information:

H. RES. 207

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby directed to furnish to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, within ten days, the following information:

TITLE I—UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD CHILE

TOTAL AID TO ALLENDE OPPONENTS

1. What was the total value, in then-year dollars, of assistance authorized by the Forty Committee, and expended, for purposes of assisting individuals, groups, or organizations opposed to the candidacy, or subsequent government, of Salvador Allende, during the period beginning in 1962 and ending with the overthrow of the Allende government on

September 11, 1973? Provide an itemized accounting for these expenditures on an annual basis. In addition, provide an itemized annual accounting of the "value" of such assistance, such value to be computed by comparing the annual expenditures, in United States dollars, with the official as well as prevailing unofficial (black market) rates of exchange for United States currency and Chilean currency.

INTERAGENCY POLICY GROUP

2. Was there an interagency group, chaired by Doctor Henry Kissinger, then the National Security Advisor to the President, established in or shortly after November 1970, to consider, evaluate, and formulate American economic policy toward Chile? If so, what was the membership of this group? List and provide copies of any documents or memorandums prepared or issued by this group, in which economic policy toward Chile is examined, reviewed, analyzed, or discussed.

ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

3. Did the executive branch of the Government of the United States adopt a policy of economic sanctions against the Government of Chile after the election of Salvador Allende as President of Chile in 1970? Was the goal of that policy to destabilize the Chilean economy and the government of President Allende? Did the executive branch of the United States Government, in pursuance of that policy, seek to—

(a) deny loans or delay the consideration of loans to Chile;

(b) limit or deny credit to Chile;

(c) prevent or hinder the renegotiation of the Chilean national debt;

(d) restrict the availability of export or credit insurance so as to restrict foreign and United States investment in Chile;

(e) cause a worsening of Chile's foreign exchange position;

(f) limit trading with Chile by American or America-based corporations;

(g) limit the availability of credit to Chile, for the purchase of agricultural commodities?

When was such a policy implemented? How were these policies implemented? How were the specific objectives achieved? If estimates were made as to how much such sanctions would cost the Government and economy of Chile, supply copies of these estimates. Who participated in the development of this policy? Who participated in attempts to accomplish the specific objectives? Under what authority of law were these activities carried out?

UNITED STATES BANKS

4. Did representatives of the executive branch of the United States Government, including but not limited to Federal bank examiners, discuss private as well as public American policies toward Chile, pursuant to the plan to impose economic sanctions on Chile, and seek the cooperation of these banks in the plan, with any or all of the following banks: Chase Manhattan, Manufacturers Hanover Trust, Bank of America, First National Bank of (New York), or Morgan Guaranty Trust? If so, which banks were contacted? When were the contacts initiated, and how often were such contacts made? Who ordered the contacts, and under what authority of law? Who actually made the contacts?

MULTILATERAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

5. Did representatives of the executive branch of the United States Government, pursuant to the plan to impose economic sanctions on Chile, seek the cooperation of American officials of or delegates to the following multilateral financial institutions, in carrying out the plan: the Export-Import Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, or the International Monetary Fund? If so, which institutions were contacted? When were the contacts ini-

March 3, 1975

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD HOUSE
Approved For Release 2001/08/30 : CIA-RDP77M00144R000800100026-8

H 1279

tiated and how often were such contacts made? Who ordered the contacts, and under what authority of law? Who actually made the contacts? What were the results of the contacts?

ECONOMIC POLICY DOCUMENTS

6. Provide copies of all memorandums, studies, instructions, cables, or other documents which pertain to the policy of economic sanctions referred to in questions 3, 4, and 5 of this title.

ASSISTANCE OF UNITED STATES CORPORATIONS

7. Did the United States Government seek or receive the cooperation of any domestic corporations, or foreign subsidiaries of domestic corporations, to act as conduits for providing financial assistance to anti-Allende groups, organizations, or individuals? If so, provide a list of the names of such corporations and their place of incorporation or, in the case of foreign subsidiaries, the name of the subsidiary as well as that of the domestic parent corporation. Describe the type and method of assistance provided by such corporations or subsidiaries.

(a) Did such corporations or subsidiaries assist in converting United States currency into foreign currencies? If so, list those corporations providing such assistance together with the amount of United States currency supplied.

(b) Were such corporations or subsidiaries solicited by officials or agents of the executive branch of the United States Government? If so, list those corporations or subsidiaries, solicited, as well as the name and position of those officials or agents of the United States Government who solicited such assistance.

(c) List any corporation or subsidiaries which, without prior solicitation by an official or agent of the Government of the United States, volunteered to assist efforts opposing the Allende Government in Chile.

ASSISTANCE OF FOREIGN CORPORATIONS

8. Did the United States Government use any foreign corporations as conduits for providing financial assistance or other aid to anti-Allende groups, individuals, or organizations in Chile? If so, what are the names and places of incorporation of these foreign corporations, and what type of assistance did these corporations provide? Did such corporations assist in the conversion of United States currency into Chilean or other foreign currency? If so, what was the total amount of funds converted? On what dates were payments of United States currency made to such corporations, and in what amounts? Describe the method through which these transactions were made. Was the assistance of such corporations solicited by officials or agents of the executive branch of the Government of the United States? If so, list the names and positions of those officials or agents.

NSC-FORTY COMMITTEE DECISIONS

9. Did the Forty Committee after January 1, 1969, authorize expenditures to assist opponents of Salvador Allende, candidate for and later President of Chile? Who participated in these decisions? List and provide copies of any and all National Security Study Memorandum (NSSM), National Security Decision Memorandum (NSDM), National Security Council Intelligence Decision (NSCID) memorandum, and Director Central Intelligence Decision (DCID) memorandum, in which American policy toward the candidacy and subsequent government of Salvador Allende are examined, including:

(a) NSSM-97, prepared in July 1970, studying United States policy options in the event Salvador Allende was elected President of Chile;

(b) NSSM-131, prepared in or about February 1971, examining, among other issues, termination of economic assistance to the Government of Chile;

(c) NDSM-136, issued in October 1971, relating to termination of economic assistance to Chile, among other issues.

TITLE II—UNITED STATES ANTI-ALLENDE OPERATIONS

AID TO THE NATIONAL PARTY

10. Did the Forty Committee authorize payments of funds intending that the recipients, through direct or indirect means, be members of the National Party of Chile? If so, what was the total amount of such payments? On what dates were such payments made, and what was the amount of each such payment? To whom were payments made, and in what currencies? Describe the method through which each payment was made.

AID TO PATRIA Y. LIBERTAD

11. Did the Forty Committee authorize payments of funds intending that the recipients, through direct or indirect means, be members of the Patria y. Libertad in Chile? If so, what was the total amount of such payments? On what dates were such payments made, and what was the amount of each such payment? To whom were the payments made, and in what currencies? Describe the method through which each payment was made.

AID TO CHRISTIAN DEMOCRATIC PARTY

12. Did the Forty Committee authorize payments of funds intending that the recipients, through direct or indirect means, be members of the Christian Democratic Party in Chile? If so, what was the total amount of such payments?

On what dates were such payments made, and what was the amount of each such payment? To whom were the payments made, and in what currencies? Describe the method through which each payment was made.

AID TO STRIKING SHOPKEEPERS AND PROFESSIONALS

13. Did the Forty Committee authorize payments of funds intending that the payments, through direct or indirect means, be used to support truckers, shopkeepers, and professionals on strike in October 1972, in Chile? If so, what was the total amount of such payments? On what dates were such payments made, and what was the amount of each such payment? To whom were the payments made, and in what currencies? Describe the method through which each payment was made.

1973 TRUCKERS STRIKE

14. Did the Forty Committee authorize payments of funds intending that the payments, through direct or indirect means, be used to support the trucker's strike in July, August, and September of 1973, in Chile? To what individuals, groups, or organizations were such payments made? What was the total amount of such payments? On what dates were such payments made, and what was the amount of each such payment? In what currencies were the payments made? Describe the method through which each payment was made.

CHILEAN INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION

15. Did the Forty Committee authorize the Central Intelligence Agency, or any of its employees or agents, to make payments to SOFOFA, an industrial association in Chile, for the purpose of assisting opposition to the government of Salvador Allende? If so, what was the total amount of such payments? On what dates were such payments made, and what was the amount of each such payment? In what currencies were the payments made? Describe the method through which each payment was made.

PAYMENTS TO PROTEXA/GRUPO MENDOZA

16. Did the Forty Committee authorize, or did the Central Intelligence Agency arrange, for payments to be made to Protexa, a company based on Monterey, Mexico, for purposes of providing assistance to anti-Allende

individuals, groups, or organizations in Chile? Were payments made to Grupo Mendoza, a company based in Caracas, Venezuela, for such purposes? If so, what was the amount of these payments, and when were the payments made to each company?

AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR FREE LABOR DEVELOPMENT

17. Did the Central Intelligence Agency, between the years 1962 and 1973, provide financial or organizational assistance to trade union groups in Chile opposed to the government of Salvador Allende through the assistance or use of the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD)? If so, describe the nature of assistance provided through the use of AIFLD. Did the Forty Committee authorize the expenditure of funds to be used to provide financial assistance and otherwise support individuals, groups, or organizations opposed to the government of Salvador Allende, with the expectation that AIFLD would be used as a conduit for this assistance and support? If so, what was the total amount of payments authorized, and what was the actual amount of payments made to or through the use of AIFLD? Provide a list of the separate dates and amounts of payments to or through the use of AIFLD.

PAYMENTS TO EL MERCURIO

18. Between 1962 and 1973, what was the total amount of financial assistance provided the Chilean newspaper El Mercurio by or through the direction of the Central Intelligence Agency? Describe the method through which such assistance was provided. In what currency was such assistance provided? Was such assistance requested or solicited, and if so, by whom?

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY PERSONNEL IN COUP

19. Were any American civilian personnel, including personnel attached to or in the employ of the Central Intelligence Agency, serving as advisors to Chilean military units, or commanders, during the two months prior to, and/or two months subsequent to, the overthrow of the Chilean Government of Salvador Allende on September 11, 1973? How many such personnel were assigned as advisors? Did any participate in the fighting that followed the coup of September 11, 1973? Were any killed or wounded? If so, how many? Provide copies of all documents, including NSCID's, DCID's, or other orders which authorized the American civilian and/or Central Intelligence Agency personnel to serve as advisors.

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT FORD

20. On what facts did you base your statement of September 16, 1974:

"In a period of time, three or four years, there was an effort being made by the Allende government to destroy opposition news media, both the writing press as well as the electronic press. And to destroy opposition political parties.

"And the effort that was made in this case was to help assist the preservation of opposition newspapers and electronic media and to preserve opposition political parties."

On February 20, the day when the resolutions were referred to the committee, the Chair forwarded them to the President and to the Secretary of State requesting their prompt replies. Those replies were received on February 26, 1975. The correspondence follows:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, D.C., February 20, 1975.

HON. GERALD R. FORD,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to request your comments on a Resolution of Inquiry which was introduced in the House

March 3, 1975

on February 19, 1975, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Enclosed are two copies of the resolution, H. Res. 207, directing the President of the United States to provide information, and to answer certain questions, relating to American policy toward Chile between 1964 and 1973. Also enclosed are two copies of H. Res. 206, directing the Secretary of State to provide similar information.

As you know, the Committee must act on this resolution within seven (7) legislative days beginning today. We will appreciate receiving your comments as soon as possible, but no later than Tuesday, February 25, 1975.

I am attaching for your information a copy of my request for comments on H. Res. 206, which I am sending to the Secretary of State.

Sincerely,

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1975.

HON. HENRY A. KISSINGER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to request your comments on a Resolution of Inquiry which was introduced in the House on February 19, 1975, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Enclosed are two copies of the resolution, H. Res. 206, directing the Secretary of State to provide information, and to answer certain questions, relating to American policy toward Chile between 1964 and 1973. Also enclosed are two copies of H. Res. 207, directing the President of the United States to provide similar information.

As you know, the Committee must act on this resolution within seven (7) legislative days beginning today. We will appreciate receiving your comments as soon as possible, but no later than Tuesday, February 25, 1975.

I am attaching for your information a copy of my request for comments on H. Res. 207, which I am sending to the President of the United States.

Sincerely,

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 26, 1975.

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The President has asked me to respond to your letter of the twentieth, and to tell you how much he appreciates the opportunity to comment on H. Res. 207.

A considerable portion of the information requested by this Resolution was previously supplied to the Foreign Affairs Committee and to other committees of the Congress by the Executive Branch. To assemble the appropriate information from the relevant agencies and individuals, moreover, would require substantial time. An important additional fact that might be considered is the establishment by the House of a Select Committee on Intelligence which may choose to consider some of the matters raised by H. Res. 207.

The Committee may also wish to consider whether such a resolution is an appropriate instrument for exploring any United States activities that might have affected Chile or any other country, for considering the extent to which names of particular persons or companies ought to be disclosed, or for considering the degree to which advice exchanged within the Executive Branch should wisely be spread on the record.

The President hopes that H. Res. 207 will not be approved.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP AREEDA,
Counsel to the President.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
AMBASSADOR AT LARGE,
Washington, February 26, 1975.

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in response to your letter of February 20, 1975 to the Secretary, requesting our comments on House Res. 206, a resolution of inquiry introduced in the House on February 19, 1975. The Honorable Phillip Areeda, Counsel to the President, has recently forwarded to you the views of the White House on a similar resolution (House Res. 207) directed to the President.

The Department of State hopes that the Foreign Affairs Committee and the House of Representatives will not approve House Res. 207 for the reasons set forth in Mr. Areeda's letter, as they are equally applicable with respect to this resolution.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. McCLOSKEY.

At the outset of the meeting, the committee heard a statement by the sponsor of the resolutions (Mr. HARRINGTON) in which he recounted his past efforts to obtain information such as that set forth in the two resolutions.

In the course of debate, the following points were made in the committee's consideration of the resolutions:

The 94th Congress has created special mechanisms for the purpose of obtaining the type of information sought in House Resolutions 206 and 107 in a logical and orderly manner:

On February 19, 1975, the same day the resolutions of inquiry were introduced, the full House approved House Resolution 138, establishing a Select Committee on Intelligence to conduct an inquiry into the organization, operations, and oversight of the intelligence community of the U.S. Government. The select committee can investigate past and present intelligence activities, including all allegations relating to U.S. involvement in Chile. In the process, the select committee is empowered to—

Require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary.

All agencies of the executive branch involved with intelligence activities may be investigated by the select committee.

A similarly empowered select committee was established by the Senate on January 27, 1975.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs is in the process of instituting procedures for the exercise of its new, special responsibility for the oversight of foreign intelligence.

On January 14, 1975, the House of Representatives adopted rules which assign to the Committee on Foreign Affairs special oversight of U.S. Government foreign intelligence activities in accordance with the Bolling-Hansen committee reform measures agreed to by the full House on October 8, 1974. This special oversight function was enlarged by sec-

tion 32 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-559, 93d Congress, S. 3394, Dec. 30, 1974) which states:

No funds appropriated under the authority of this or any other Act may be expended by or on behalf of the Central Intelligence Agency for operations in foreign countries, other than activities intended solely for obtaining necessary intelligence, unless and until the President finds that each such operation is important to the national security of the United States and reports, in a timely fashion, a description and scope of such operation to the appropriate committees of the Congress, including the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives.

In the adoption of its rules on February 20, 1975, the Committee on Foreign Affairs vested oversight of foreign intelligence activities in its Subcommittee on Oversight. In the course of the full committee's consideration of House Resolutions 206 and 207, assurances were given by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight that the question of U.S. Government involvement in Chile during the period cited in the resolutions would be brought up before the Oversight Subcommittee.

House Resolution 206 and House Resolution 207 are drafted in such a manner as to cast doubt on their standing as bona fide "privileged resolutions of inquiry" under House rules and precedents.

According to "Deschler's Procedure" (15/1;24/3), a resolution of inquiry directing a head of an executive agency to furnish information to a committee rather than directly to the House may not be entitled to privileged status. House Resolutions 206 and 207 direct the Secretary of State and the President, respectively, to furnish certain information to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, not to the full House.

According to the Rules of the House of Representatives (para. 857), a resolution of inquiry may not be accorded privileged status if it requires investigations. Both House Resolution 206 and 207 request information covering a period between 1962 and 1973 and involving the activities of four Presidents, three Secretaries of State, numerous Government agencies, international organizations, and foreign and domestic bodies. The accumulation of such material will require investigative procedures on the part of the executive branch. Moreover, the large volume of information in question would require much longer to produce than the 10 days called for in the resolutions.

The sponsor of House Resolution 206 and House Resolution 207 is currently the plaintiff in a civil suit against the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency et al., charging that certain activities of that Agency are illegal and beyond its statutory authority. United States involvement in Chile is specifically referred to in the plaintiff's petition. A question was raised whether the use of a resolution of inquiry to obtain information which is also involved in pending litigation, would be appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I am making this statement in order to apprise the House of what has transpired in the Committee on Foreign Affairs on February 27, and to draw attention to those major issues which motivated the committee to table House Resolution 206 and House Resolution 207.

At this point, I ask leave to include in the record the texts of the two resolutions and the exchange of correspondence with the President of the United States and the Secretary of State.

MAIL SERVICE

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, it is hardly a secret to any Member of this body that Americans generally are deeply unhappy about the poor quality of our mail service.

It is bad. It is getting worse. It has grown steadily more costly.

On any given day I can be sure of receiving letters from my south Texas district—arriving a week after they were mailed—complaining about the deterioration of what used to be as good a postal system as could be found anywhere in the world. The complaints come not only from business and individual users of the mails but from postal employees as well.

Yes, from postal employees—although as a postmaster in south Texas wrote me recently—

Of course you know we are not supposed to contact you—and are threatened with adverse action if we do.

He went ahead to give details about personnel reduction in his office and low morale among the employees. A letter carrier had to resort to a letter to editor to explain why the mail was delivered late.

Of course most of the letters I receive about poor mail service do not come from postal workers. They come from bewildered men and women who are unable to understand why a letter is received in the Rio Grande Valley 2 weeks after it was mailed in St. Joseph, Mo. They come from people in south Texas who have received parcel post packages almost a month after they were sent from New York City. They come from pensioners whose monthly checks are unconscionably delayed. They come from businessmen who must depend on the mails to stay in business.

I have found, as I am sure other Members have found, that there is little point in forwarding such complaints to the U.S. Postal Service. The response is almost without exception a nonresponse, unsatisfactory in every sense of the word.

Mr. Speaker, the transformation in 1970 of the old Post Office Department into a publicly controlled corporation, the U.S. Postal Service, simply has not worked. The change was supposed, as we were told, to improve service magnificently by "taking politics out of postal service." But it has not worked out that way. Instead, the service has been taken out of our mail system. There is no way

today that you can mail a letter from here to there with any assurance that it will be delivered within a reasonable time. There is not much assurance that it will be delivered at all.

This nonservice, ironically, is proving hideously expensive. Postage rates have climbed as service declined. Congress has been asked repeatedly to increase the Federal appropriation for the postal system. So far as we can tell, the money has gone down the drain with no benefit to the average user of the mails, and this was one of the reasons we were asked to "take the politics out" now the very same people complain bitterly about the "poor service."

Nearly all Americans have a stake in adequate mail service. They are not receiving it at this time. It is my feeling that Congress has a clear responsibility to take steps to remedy this situation.

I believe it is time to admit that a mistake was made in creating the U.S. Postal Service. I believe it is time to correct that mistake. What we have now is far inferior to what we used to have—and much more costly as well.

Accordingly, I have introduced a bill to abolish the Postal Service as now constituted and to reestablish the Post Office as an executive department of the Government. I respectfully urge my colleagues to consider this proposal on its merits. We owe it to the people we represent to answer their cries for help in restoring decent mail service.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 28, 1975.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 11:45 A.M. on Friday, February 28, 1975, and said to contain a message from the President of the United States in which he transmits the Twenty-Fourth Annual Report of the National Science Foundation.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

24TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 94-65)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Technology and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to submit to the Congress the Twenty-Fourth Annual Report of the National Science Foundation, covering fiscal year 1974.

One of the clear lessons of the past few

years is that our society, as well as that of the rest of the world, is intimately tied to technology and the science that produces it. Certainly our own approaches to problems in energy, environment, food production, and the well-being of the national economy will include substantial contributions from science and technology. As a Nation we are fortunate to have an extraordinarily strong science and technology base to draw on in dealing with these and other important national problems.

The National Science Foundation has a key role in ensuring that the Nation maintains leadership in all fields of basic science from which our technological advances of the future will be derived.

The National Science Foundation programs in basic research range over fundamental studies of the structure and behavior of matter, the process of living things, the dynamics of the Earth and universe, energy and materials and many other areas described in this report. In addition, as this report shows, the Foundation is continuing, through its programs in science education, to assist in the development of the scientific manpower needed to meet tomorrow's technological challenges.

The research results contained in this report remind us of the changes that we have seen in our lives as a result of our investments in science. It is, I believe, a preview of many beneficial developments that will occur in coming years. I commend this report to you.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 28, 1975.

14TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

America's traditional optimism about the manageability of human affairs is being challenged, as never before, by a host of problems. In the field of national security, arms control offers a potential solution to many of the problems we currently face. The genius of the American people may be said to lie in their ability to search for and find practical solutions, even to the most difficult of problems; and it is no accident that this country has helped lead the world in the quest for international arms control agreements.

Safeguarding our national security requires a dual effort. On the one hand, we must maintain an adequate defense against potential great-power adversaries; for although we are pursuing a positive policy of détente with the Communist world, ideological differences and conflicting interests can be expected to continue. On the other hand, we share with them, as with the rest of the world, a common interest in a stable international community.

Over the past year, we have made considerable progress in our arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union. The Vladivostok accord which I reached with Chairman Brezhnev will enable our two countries to establish significant limits on the strategic arms race and will set the stage for negotiations on reductions at a later phase. The United States and United Socialist Soviet Republic have, over the past year, also reached agreement on the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and on a limitation on ABM deployments to one complex for each country.

The negotiations being held at Vienna on mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe (MBFR), while they have not yet produced conclusive results, are also an important endeavor to limit and reduce armaments safely through mutual agreement. For our part, we shall make every effort to achieve such an outcome.

Even as we see some encouraging progress in our relations with the Soviet Union, we still face a growing danger in the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons to more countries. The U.S. will continue to seek practical steps to avert this danger, while providing the benefits of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

The fourteenth annual report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which I herewith transmit to the Congress, sets forth the steps which have been taken over the past year to meet these and other national security problems through arms control.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 1975.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE PRIVACY PROTECTION STUDY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a) (1), Public Law 93-579, the Chair appoints as members of the Privacy Protection Study Commission the following Members on the part of the House: the gentleman from New York, Mr. KOCH, and the gentleman from California, Mr. GOLDWATER.

A BETTER ORDERING OF THE PUBLIC'S BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the subject of my special order is the need for a better ordering of the public's business by this Chamber. I was inspired to ask for this time after reading a very exceptional statement prepared by the minority clerk of the House of Representatives, Mr. Joe Bartlett, whom we all know and admire. Mr. Bartlett came to the statement after a lifelong dedication to this institution which began in high school days as a Page in the House, and with the exception of two brief periods of military service with the U.S. Marine

Corps, Mr. Bartlett has devoted his entire working life to this institution. He now occupies the senior professional staff position on the Republican side. Prior to being elected clerk to the minority in 1970, Joe Bartlett served for many years as the highly skilled reading clerk of the House.

So, his examination of the way in which this body conducts the public's business is that of an affectionate friend. I know of no one who is more jealous of the institutions of the House of Representatives than Joe Bartlett, nor one more eager than he to see the House enhanced as an effective instrument of democracy. The title of his commentary is "Everybody's Business," and I hope it will become just that. Since the text of Mr. Bartlett's treatise was inserted in the RECORD by our minority leader, Mr. RHODES, last week, I have heard a number of my colleagues, as well as several people beyond this Chamber, comment favorably on it. My purpose in taking this time is to direct attention of others who might have missed it, because I believe it deserves the thoughtful, earnest and prompt consideration of all who prize this institution.

The points Mr. Bartlett makes are, in my view, eminently sound. His recommendations have nothing to do with his position as a professional aide to the minority. His perspective is free of all petty, personal or partisan considerations. His proposals should be equally appealing to all Members of Congress, and to all concerned citizens.

In it he makes some very challenging suggestions on how we can better serve the people that we are called to represent. He, first of all, recommends that the Congress go back to the original date contemplated by the Constitution for the convening of Congress. Congress would meet on the first Monday in December, and at that time they would carry forward with the organization of the House, the election of officers, the adoption of rules, the selection of committees, and the receiving of the President's budget message. After that business is done, Mr. Bartlett suggests that this body adjourn, as a body, until early in February.

This period would permit the committees of the House to immediately get down to work without the distractions and interruptions of sessions of the House. It would also be the time for congressional budgeteers to conduct a broad appraisal of the President's budget, and to publish a statement of overall exceptions and limitations for the general guidance of the authorizing committees. So that when the Congress resumed in February there would be well-considered grist ready for the legislative mill.

This would be a period exclusively for authorizing legislation, establishing programs, enunciating policy. Mr. Bartlett has proposed some incentives which would surely work to encourage the timely reporting of measures, and perhaps prevent some of the ill-considered measures that find their way into the final rush of a session, and which ought to be postponed for the more deliberate attention of the next session.

One of the most attractive features of

his recommendations is the "breather" between the authorizing and funding sessions, to permit an exchange of views between the people and their representatives about the programs authorized before we commit their tax moneys. This period of 6 weeks or so might prove to be the best investment in time in the whole legislative calendar year.

At least, when the Congress came back for its appropriating session in June, it could claim some guidance from the people, and it ought to be able to complete all funding measures in less than 2 months of orderly work.

By this means the House, I believe, would be ordering its time much more efficiently than under the present procedure. We have the spectacle this year of still having not authorized certain bills for the fiscal year which is nearly three-fourths completed.

It is impossible for this institution to function efficiently when it does not even complete the authorizing process, despite the fact that three-fourths of the fiscal year for which the authority is requested has been consumed.

In any event, I think our good friend, Joe Bartlett, has rendered us all a great service in putting down in precise language the recommendations that he feels would make for a much more efficient handling of the public business, and I commend the text of the presentation to the attention of the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the presentation follows:
"EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS"—THE WORK OF CONGRESS

(By Joe Bartlett)

"That which is everybody's business, is nobody's business," or so Izaak Walton quoted the wisdom of a friend. He probably did not have in mind the people's business as performed by their representatives in Congress assembled, but it bears some comparison.

In our own special, ingenious, brand of democracy—our elected, representative, republican form of government—the responsibility for the fundamental conduct of the people's business is so broadly shared as to lose identity and to escape attention.

To describe our representative system as merely "ingenious" is to vastly understate the tremendous respect and admiration that a third of a century of working within that system has engendered. It is brilliant; it is beautiful; and I am thoroughly convinced that such a visionary plan of self-government could only have been the inspiration of Divine collaboration. Still, I stop short of declaring it sacred. After all, it was devised as an arrangement among fallible and mortal men. And it is to be respected and appreciated not so much as a venerable national institution, but rather for its effectiveness and usefulness as an instrument serving our citizens so very well for such a long time.

However, even the finest instrument is no better than the hands that guide it, and while I can find precious little fault with our basic system of government, I must admit we have not always used that system as wisely nor as well as we might have.

Even some who are not as prejudiced as I, regard the House of Representatives, or at least, the Congress, as the heart of the American body politic. It is to this vital organ of government that I would invite your examination.

Many have a cursory concern for the Congress, and many—so very many—have diag-